

ALAN WATT BLURB (i.e. Educational Talk):
"TECHNOCRACY MOCKS De-MOCK-RA-Sees —
COVERT PERSUADERS"
September 20, 2007

Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - September 20, 2007
(Exempting Music and Literary Quotes)

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Hi folks. I'm Alan Watt and this is cuttingthroughthematrix.com. You can also find me at alanwattsentientsentinel.eu. It is September 20th, 2007.

On last night's radio talk on RBN, I was going through a book called "***The Technological Society***" by Jacques Ellul. This man is a master at understanding human nature individually and collectively and the systems that are running our lives, which are all really today the one system. We call it democracy. Democracy itself has never been static. The definition is changing constantly and it still has some ways to go to achieve its final goal because it's to be a world run by experts. These experts are called technocrats. They are masters in marketing and marketing ideas into your mind. That's exactly what Bertrand Russell said they would have to employ on a grand scale to achieve this objective of a new type of global system.

When you hear terms used like "*New Deal*" and "*New Freedom*" et cetera coming out of the mouths of presidents, you better take note because they are giving you a new legal definition of the system that you're now in. A New Freedom - you see, the Constitution was the "old deal." The New Deal was a new type of government or governance and a new way of dealing with the public at large, a system using statistics and data collection to run the mass-man at the expense of the individual - actually, the elimination of the individual. New Freedom is actually a curtailment on all freedoms and no one really objects to it, as you can see. Jacques Ellul didn't just become a genius in his field. He was trained from a very early age and given access to data never put into public libraries. The data collection on the human personality goes back thousands of years. We're the most studied species on the planet.

Jacques Ellul's book, "***The Technological Society***," on **page 262** he says:

"In the conflict between politician and technicians, corruption is a much more serious matter. Political milieus are very generally corrupt. The fact is indisputable, both in democratic regimes such as France and the United States and in authoritarian systems such as Fascism, Francoism, and Nazism. We cannot really speak about the Soviet Union. The vertigo of power and the opportunity to become rich corrupt politicians very quickly. To the degree that the state becomes more and more technical, there is increasing contact between politicians and

technicians. Though technique tends more and more to have primacy over politics, and technical decisions seem unassailable by parliaments, the takeover of technique can be arrested by corruption. The technician is a man, and in contact with corrupt men he may well allow himself to be corrupted. He can sidetrack his technique, annul the decisions demanded by its strict application, and grant some favor or special privilege which perverts technical action. In such an instance, general interests (the only true objects of politics) no longer control technique; particular interests (which are much more efficient in checking technical action) do. Pure technique represents the general interests, the true politics, and is opposed to the politician who represents the corrupting element for private and hence politically nonexistent reasons. The corruption of politicians is the only factor which can retard the total transformation of the state into a gigantic, exclusively technical apparatus."

Alan: What he's telling us is that politicians, when they get corrupted, meaning less efficient at what they're supposed to be doing, will slow down the transformation of the state into a gigantic, exclusively technical apparatus. That is why The Royal Institute for International Affairs with its America branch the CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) was formed. Margaret Thatcher made mention of this in her world tour where she said that we ex-politicians know each other and we know the system. We're far more efficient than those who are just coming into politics or taking over the reins of power. That matches what The Royal Institute for International Affairs was set up to do because they've announced on television and in Canada through the CFR that they drafted up for instance the amalgamation contracts for the Americas. They were also involved in the ones for Europe prior to that, because they also believe being technocrats that politicians are simply too slow and clumsy and they're in the way of progress. That's exactly what Jacques Ellul was talking about here.

On page 263 Ellul goes on:

"The transformation of the state and the consequent predominance of technicians involves two elements. First, the technician considers the nation very differently from the politician. For the technician, the nation is essentially an affair to be managed, for (rightly) he remains imbued with the private origin of technique; as a consequence, the private and the public spheres are poorly delimited. All that the technician can take into account is the application of his instruments whether in the service of the state or of something else is of small importance. For him, the state is not the expression of popular will, or a creation of God, or the essence of humanity, or a modality of the class war. It is an enterprise with certain services which ought to function properly. It is an enterprise which ought to be profitable, yield a maximum of efficiency, and have the nation for its working capital."

Alan: That's what happened you see. We are the working capital of a nation. That's why you have a social insurance number given as soon as you're born in some countries, your SIN number. You're property. You're put down as collateral. You will payoff the previous generations debt. Interesting enough, they use the Old Testament in all Masonic lodges as a Book of the Law. If you read into there where slavery is concerned, you'll find that the children born of a slave are also the property of the slave owner until at least the debt is paid off. Same thing. It hasn't changed in thousands of years.

Thomas Jefferson himself said that any generation born into a system where there was preexisting debt that they had to pay off meant that they were in fact slaves. He wanted every generation's debt to be written off after a set number of years to stop this from happening because he knew where it would go because he knew its history.

On page 264 Ellul is talking about how it would be changed over from debating in politics to relying upon the technicians who go in a different direction as they view things differently. He says:

"The entire administration is only a machine whose operations must become more and more rigorous. In this way, that ideal theoretical situation is attained in which, to use the words of James K. Feely, Jr., the "margin of chance between intention and realization" is almost nil. For, according to Feely, the smaller this margin becomes, the more a check on execution appears possible, and the more the coefficient of predictability is increased. Such a situation would give maximum security in all the different administrative units and what Feely proposed as a theoretical ideal becomes practical. The only price tag on its attainment is the conversion of the administration into an apparatus, the civil servants into objects, and the nation into a supplier of working capital.

The nation becomes the object of the technical state in that it furnishes all the different kinds of material substratum: men, money, economy, and so on. The state becomes a machine designed to exploit the means of the nation. The relation between state and nation is henceforth completely different from what it had been before. The nation is no longer primarily a human, geographic, and historical entity. It is an economic power whose resources must be put to work, and to which a "yield" must be returned. In connection with this yield, the older technicians use the term maximum but the newer ones use the term optimum. Maximum yield is yield that exhausts and debases the resources of the state in a short interval of time; optimum yield is a yield that attempts to safeguard substance and vitality, the typical example being the TVA. However, this may be, we must regard the nation as an entity whose total resources are to be brought into action precisely because all the different techniques, mutually conditioning one another..."

Alan: That's very important you see. That's through all the associations including police that you think are part of your culture, all networked together and they help condition each other along with techniques which are in use.

"...mutually conditioning each other come into play. Once the technician has commenced his operations, he cannot recognize any limits. He cannot esteem or respect anything in the nation except the "nature of things." This promotes the greater coherence of the state-nation which is so characteristic of our times. What is true on the national level is also true on the level of international organization. In view of the radical setbacks experienced by the political organisms designed to foster international agreement it was decided to entrust further exploration along these lines to a group of technicians. It was believed that international consideration of the areas to be exploited, rather than purely national interests would be more propitious to an entente. Thus, in 1949 a great assemblage consisting of 550 scientists and technicians opened its deliberations at Lake Success to consider how best to exploit the world's natural resources.

International projects of this kind are much less advanced than similar international projects, and the reactions of politicians to the technicians are correspondingly more enthusiastic. This was evident at the 1949 Strasbourg assembly of the Organisation Européenne de Coopération Economique..."

Alan: Which was of course the start of the Common Market to integrate Europe and that was the technical group who arranged it. It was above and outside of politics that it was achieved and that again goes back to the CFR when they boasted they drafted up the unification plans for the Americas. They're outside of the voting public. They're experts in their class the technicians.

..."The Americans were of the opinion that this organization did not progress as quickly as the technical situation permitted. We are witnesses at the inception on the international level, of the same "takeover" by the technicians which we have already observed on the national level."

Alan: In other words, back in 1949 they were already working hard towards internationalism and the technicians again with all their data collection and statistics were in charge of it all.

On page 301 he goes on to talk Technique Unchecked:

"At present, there's no counterbalance to technique. In a society in equilibrium, every new cultural tendency, every new impulse, encounters a certain number of obstacles which act as a societies first line of defense. This is not due to the interplay of conservative and revolutionary forces in general, nor in particular to the play between the means of production and the organs of consumption. It is rather due to the simple fact that every new factor must be integrated into the cultural framework, and this process requires a certain period of time because it entails modifications of the two interacting elements. It is never initially clear that the new factor will be acceptable to the cultural complex. On the one hand is a kind of process of selection and on the other a resistance that gradually abates. A number of different forces play this restraining role. I shall discuss four of them.

"The first is morality...."

Alan: Very important chapter.

"Every civilization has rules of precise conduct, which are covered by the term morality in either its French or its Anglo-Saxon meaning. They may be conscious and thought out, or unconscious and spontaneous. They determine what is good and what is bad and consequently, admit or reject a given innovation. Very close to morality, public opinion comprises a set of much more irrational reactions which are not necessarily related to good and evil. For reasons still poorly understood, public opinion may be impelled in a certain direction under the influence of a given impulse, or it may remain refractory. Obviously, public opinion is decisive in the interaction between morality and a new factor. It can render morality obsolete or lead it to triumph. A third restraining force is social structure, which includes both social morphology and economic or legal structure. The social structure reacts strongly whenever new factors threaten to modify it. (This, incidentally, is the only one of the four factors retained by Marxism.) Systems or ideas are no longer the sole operative factors; economic relations or sociological

factors can disturb the equilibrium even of a situation the stability of which was previously thought assured. Finally there is the state, the special organ of defense of a society, which reacts with every means at its disposal against all disturbing forces."

Alan: Now what he's showing you there are other things that must be attacked in order to change the entire structure of the system including morality, et cetera, et cetera and that has happened. There's been war on all of these particular parts of society for a hundred years, speeding up since the '60's.

On page 303 he says some truths here which people don't like but it's always true.

"Public opinion is all the more important in that it has a two-pronged element. In the first place, there is modern man's collective worship of the power of fact..."

Alan: That's very important.

".... modern man's collective worship of the power of fact which is displayed in every technique and which is manifested in his total devotion to its overwhelming progress. This adoration is not passive but truly mystical. Men sacrifice themselves to it and lose themselves in the search for it. In this sense Mussolini was right in speaking of men realizing themselves in and through the state, the collective instrument of power. The martyrs of science or of the air force or of the atomic pile give us the most profound sense of this worship when we see the deference the crowd pays them. "I have faith in technique," declared Henry Wallace, the former Secretary of Commerce of the United States. His faith indeed dwells in men's hearts. Man is scandalized when he is told that technique causes evil; the scourges engendered by one technique will be made good by still other techniques. This is society's normal attitude."

Alan: We see that, for instance, in medicine because we all worship this progress, this technique of progress. This isn't really defined to us as who would say it was actually progress. We see it with the effects of medications and so on, and the side effects and fallout, we see it with the effects of autism through certain inoculations and then all the treatments they have to go and try to help them and get back to as near as normal as possible. We never lose our faith even when the technique itself partly or completely destroys us or other people.

"In the second place, there is the deep conviction that technical problems are the only serious ones. The amused glance people give the philosopher; the lack of interest displayed in metaphysical and theological questions ("Byzantine" quarrels); the rejection of the humanities which comes from the conviction that we are living in a technical age and education must correspond to it; the search for the immediately practical, carrying the implication that history is useless and can serve no practical ends—all these are symptomatic of that "reasonable" conviction which pervades the social hierarchy and is identical for all social classes. "Only technique is not mere gab." It is positive and brings about real achievements. In these two ways, the mystic and the rational public opinion is completely oriented toward technique."

Alan: We worship it, in other words, this thing called science and progress and all

the rest of it.

"And at present another precise technique molds public opinion with reference to any given question. This technique has never been fully exploited because public opinion is favorable enough to technique without it. But if a sudden change should occur and public opinion should turn against technique, we would see the propaganda machinery set into motion to re-create a favorable atmosphere, for the whole social edifice would be at stake."

Alan: We saw that with the arrogance with which they tried to bring us all through into the European Union and eventually they, against their better judgment or will, gave different countries the vote. When people said "no, we don't want it," they didn't listen. They had massive advertising campaigns telling the public that my God if you didn't join this union and trade and all the rest of it they'd be left behind. Multibillions were spent to convince the public, to terrify the public that they had to join it or they'd end up in poverty. This same technique was used here in North America to do with NAFTA and all the rest of it, exactly the same thing; you'll be left behind. Same slogans that they borrowed from the European Union and that's the same slogans they're using now when little countries who haven't yet joined the European common market, they'll be left behind. They'll be bypassed. The propaganda arm goes into effect to terrify you into voting the expected way, the way they want you to vote.

However, it doesn't matter anyway. You see the United Nations already came out with its super-city scheme a few years back and told the countries and the mayors, because they all belonged to the UN organizations and international mayors et cetera, all belonged to these gangs, and they all get the same format given to them at the same time from the United Nations. They're told to create super-cities, the new super-city-state by amalgamating all the smaller cities into them. It was going to be cheaper they lied to everybody, and places like Toronto were the first ones to do it against the will of the public. In fact, they started doing it without the consent of the public, because we're run by technicians now, not really by the politicians.

When the public really strongly objected in Toronto and elsewhere against the amalgamation, because "something smelled bad in the state of Denmark," as they say, they knew that taxes would go up and all the lies they were being given were just that. They were lies. The government eventually says or the city says, "Okay, we'll give you the vote," so they gave them the vote and a massive advertising campaign and about 70-odd percent, 80 percent of the public says, "No, we don't want to amalgamate." Then the city turned around and told them "we know what you voted for, but you're going to get it anyway." That's democracy in action. That's how it works.

You see the public opinion is a nuisance to them. We are in the way of progress; and this is going to get worse. It's already getting worse and under the guise of terrorism, it's steamrolling ahead. There's no input from the public being even considered at all.

On page 324 Ellul talks about how we're changed so quickly by technique.

"The technical society is capable of recreating man as a very different

whole from what he was a century ago. It is able to re-establish "equilibrium" at a higher or lower point (according to the criteria employed); but in any case, to establish it at a different level from the one maintained before the technical era.

Modification of the Milieu and Space. Technique has penetrated the deepest recesses of the human being. The machine tends not only to create a new human environment, but also to modify man's very essence. The milieu in which he lives is no longer his. He must adapt himself, as though the world were new, to a universe for which he was not created. He was made to go six kilometers an hour, and he goes a thousand. He was made to eat when he was hungry and to sleep when he was sleepy; instead, he obeys a clock. He was made to have contact with living things, and he lives in a world of stone. He was created with a certain essential unity, and he is fragmented by all the forces of the modern world.

Admittedly, the machine has enriched man as it has changed him. The machine's senses and organs have multiplied the powers of human senses and organs, enabling man to penetrate a new milieu and revealing to him unknown sights, liberties, and servitudes. He has been liberated little by little from physical constraints, but he is all the more the slave of abstract ones. He acts through intermediaries and consequently has lost contact with reality. The interested reader may wish to consult Friedman's admirable work concerning the separation of the worker from his material. Man as worker has lost contact with the primary element of life and environment, the basic material out of which he makes what he makes. He no longer knows wood or iron or wool. He is acquainted only with the machine. His capacity to become a mechanic has replaced his knowledge of his material; this development has occasioned profound mental and psychic transformations which cannot yet be assessed.

Men with scientific knowledge of materials are found only in research institutes. But they never use these materials or see them and have merely an abstract knowledge of their properties. The men who actually use the materials to produce a finished product no longer know them. They follow engineering specifications, using the only object they will ever know firsthand: the machine. Even so, it cannot be said that man is adapted to the machine. The pilot of the supersonic aircraft at its maximum velocity becomes, in a sense, completely one with his machine. But immobilized in a network of tubes and ducts, he is deaf, blind, and impotent. His senses have been replaced by dials which inform him what is taking place. Built into his helmet, for example, is an electroencephalographic apparatus which can warn him of an imminent rarefaction of oxygen before his senses could have told him. We can say he "subsists" in abnormal conditions; but we cannot say he is adapted to them in any really human sense. And his situation is not exceptional. It is not only in work (which takes up a great part of his life) that man encounters this transformation. His environment as a whole—everything that goes to make up his milieu, his livelihood, habitat, and habits—is modified."

Alan: Now remember, this book was written in 1964.

One page 432 he says:

"A Look at the Year 2000. This was from a weekly magazine, the Express of Paris published a series of extracts from texts by American and Russian

scientists concerning society in the year 2000."

Alan: So here they are in 1960 printing this to see how far they've come along their planned predictions.

"As long as such visions were purely a literary concern of science fiction writers and sensational journalists, it was possible to smile at them. Now we have like works from Nobel Prize winners, members of the Academy of Sciences of Moscow, and other scientific notables whose qualifications are beyond dispute. The visions of these gentlemen put science fiction in the shade. By the year 2000, voyages to the moon will become commonplace..."

Alan: Well, if they are, we're not being told about it. I'm not saying they're not.

"...so will inhabited artificial satellites."

Alan: We have them, that's for sure.

"All food will be completely synthetic."

Alan: We've been going that way with the modified foods and it's going to get a lot worse too. It is planned to become eventually all synthetic.

"The world's population will have increase fourfold but will have been stabilized. Sea water and ordinary rocks will yield all the necessary metals."

Alan: That hasn't been done, unless they're keeping it secret.

"Disease, as well as famine, will have been eliminated..."

Alan: Well sure they have, only they've got to keep it going to keep down the population; and that's been the big problem from all the guys at the top at the World Health Organization. How do you bring down the population *and* increase the lifespan? They're diametrically opposed to each other, so they've got to do one or the other.

"...The problem of energy production will have been completely resolved."

Alan: That is true, but you cannot have a free society having free energy and keep control of them if you want to be the boss. You've got to make sure they're interdependent on you, and that's where we are today, interdependence. You'll never ever be given any free energy especially when they want to corral everyone into habitat areas when there's to be no vehicles et cetera, et cetera and make you behave, which means you have to work for the system to pay the system.

"The problem of energy production will have been completely resolved. Serious scientists, it must be repeated, are the source of these predictions, which hitherto were found only to philosophic utopias. The most remarkable predictions concern the transformation of educational methods and the problem of human reproduction. Knowledge will be accumulated in "electronic banks"..."

Alan: That's computers you see.

"...and transmitted directly to the human nervous system by means of coded electronic messages."

Alan: They knew back in 1960 where they were heading, of course, because that was part of their plan.

"There will no longer be any need of reading or learning mountains of useless information; everything will be received and registered according to the needs of the moment. There will be no need of attention or effort. What is needed will pass directly from the machine to the brain without going through consciousness."

Alan: That's what they can do. We know that. They've been doing human brain to computer interfaces for quite some time in experiments.

"In the domain of genetics, natural reproduction will be forbidden."

Alan: That's what they were saying back then.

"A stable population will be necessary, and it will consist of the highest human types."

Alan: He doesn't mention the human genome project, but that's what that was all about.

"Artificial insemination will be employed. This, according to Muller, will permit the introduction into a carrier uterus of an ovum fertilized in vitro, ovum and sperm having been taken from persons representing the masculine ideal and the feminine ideal, respectively. The reproductive cells in question will preferably be those of persons dead long enough that a true perspective of their lives and works, free of all personal prejudice, can be seen. Such cells will be taken from cell banks and will represent the most precious genetic heritage of humanity. The method will have to be applied universally. If the people of a single country were to apply it intelligently and intensively they would quickly attain a practically invincible level of superiority."

Alan: So we're talking about eugenics, you see. That's why they'd have to bring the whole world along the same path at the same time, meaning they have to have the control of the world, otherwise you'd have a race of superman that would conquer the rest of the world.

"If the people of a single country were to apply it intelligently and intensively they would quickly attain a practically invincible level of superiority. Here is a future Huxley never dreamed of. Perhaps instead of marveling or being shocked, we ought to reflect a little. A question no one ever asks when confronted with the scientific wonders of the future concerns the interim period. Consider, for example, the problem of automation, which will become acute in a very short time. How, socially, politically, morally, and humanly shall we contrive to get there? How are the prodigious economic problems, for example, of unemployment, to be solved? And, in Muller's more distant utopia how shall we force humanity to

refrain from begetting children naturally? How shall we force them to submit to constant and rigorous hygienic controls? How shall man be persuaded to accept a radical transformation of his traditional modes of nutrition? How and where shall we relocate a billion and a half persons who today make their livings from agriculture and who, in the promised ultra rapid conversion of the next forty years, will become completely useless as cultivators of the soil?"

Alan: You see back in the 1960's they knew they'd have to do away with small farming, family farming. They said at the UN that farming was too important to be left to farmers. It's for the big agri-food businesses. That's part of the technique as well.

"How will we handle the control and occupation of outer space in order to provide a stable modus vivendi? How shall national boundaries be made to disappear? (One of the last two would be a necessity.) There are many other "hows," but they are conveniently left unformulated. When we reflect on the serious although relatively minor problems that were provoked by the industrial exploitation of coal and electricity, when we reflect that after a hundred and fifty years these problems are still not satisfactorily resolved, we are entitled to ask whether there are any solutions to the infinitely more complex "hows" of the next forty years. In fact, there is one and only one means to their solution, a worldwide totalitarian dictatorship which will allow technique its full scope and at the same time resolve the concomitant difficulties."

Alan: So there you are. That's the only solution they could have: Terror, terror, terror and a worldwide dictatorship, totalitarian.

"It is not difficult to understand why the scientists and worshippers of technology prefer not to dwell on the solution but rather to leap nimbly across the dull and uninteresting intermediary period and land squarely in the golden age. We might indeed ask ourselves if we will succeed in getting through the transition period at all or if the blood and suffering required are not perhaps too high a price to pay for this golden age."

Alan: And that's what Mr. Rockefeller meant when he says "we have a window of opportunity," meaning it would close eventually, they'd have to nimbly get us across this big gap with all of its problems, or else the public might get a bit upset when they caught on to what was happening.

"If we take a hard, unromantic look at the golden age itself, we are struck with the incredible naiveté of these scientists. They say, for example, that they will be able to shape and reshape at will human emotions, desires, and thoughts and arrive scientifically at certain efficient, pre-established collective decisions. They claim they will be in a position to develop certain collective desires, to constitute certain homogeneous social units out of aggregates of individuals, to forbid men to raise their children, and even to persuade them to renounce having any. At the same time, they speak of assuring the triumph of freedom and of the necessity of avoiding dictatorship at any price. They seem incapable of grasping the contradiction involved, or of understanding that what they are proposing, even after the intermediary period, is in fact the harshest of dictatorships. In comparison, Hitler's was a trifling affair. That it is to be a dictatorship of test tubes rather than of hobnailed boots will not make it any less a dictatorship."

Alan: Yes, the people will be eventually tested to see – they're already pushing this to see if you're "fit" to be a parent. They've already confused what parenting is all about. They confused even the gender issues. When there's no normal to compare anything to, then the culture is in flux. It's plastic. It can be molded and shaped, because that's how we arrive at conclusions and make decisions and compare it to what is normal. Once it's all bent out of shape, mixed up together, then anything is possible and you're being guided along a new path. You're not making your own decisions. You can't in fact make your own decisions because you have nothing to compare your data with, since normalcy is gone.

"When our savants characterize their golden age in any but scientific terms, they emit a quantity of down-at-the-heel platitudes that would gladden the heart of the pettiest politician. Let's take a few samples. "To render human nature nobler, more beautiful, and more harmonious." What on earth can this mean? What criteria, what content, do they propose? Not many, I fear, would be able to reply. "To assure the triumph of peace, liberty, and reason." Fine words with no substance behind them. "To eliminate cultural lag." What culture? And would the culture they have in mind be able to subsist in this harsh social organization? "To conquer outer space." For what purpose? The conquest of space seems to be an end in itself, which dispenses with any need for reflection. We are forced to conclude that our scientists are incapable of any of the emptiest platitudes when they stray from their specialties. It makes one think back on the collection of mediocrities accumulated by Einstein when he spoke of God, the state, peace and the meaning of life. It is clear that Einstein, extraordinary mathematical genius that he was, was no Pascal; he knew nothing of political or human reality, or, in fact, anything at all outside his mathematical reach. The banality of Einstein's remarks in matters outside his specialty is as astonishing as his genius within it. It seems as though the specialized application of all one's faculties in a particular area inhibits the consideration of things in general.

Even J. Robert Oppenheimer, who seems receptive to a general culture, is not outside this judgment. His political and social declarations, for example, scarcely go beyond the level of those of the man in the street. And the opinions of the scientists quoted by L-Express are not even on the level of Einstein or Oppenheimer. The pomposities, in fact, do not rise to the level of the average. They are vague generalities inherited from the nineteenth century, and the fact that they represent the furthest limits of thought of our scientific worthies must be symptomatic of arrested development or of a mental block. Particularly disquieting is the gap between the enormous power they wield and their critical ability, which must be established as null. To wield power well entails a certain faculty of criticism, discrimination, judgment, and option. It is impossible to have confidence in men who apparently lack these faculties. Yet it is apparently our fate to be facing a "golden age" in the power of sorcerers who are totally blind to the meaning of the human adventure. When they speak of preserving the seed of outstanding men, whom, pray, do they mean to be the judges."

Alan: He's talking about who shall live, who shall die, who'll be born, who won't.

"It is clear, alas, that they propose to sit in judgment themselves. It is hardly likely that they will deem a Rimbaud or a Nietzsche worthy of posterity. When they announce that they will conserve the genetic mutations which appear

to them most favorable, and that they propose to modify the very germ cells in order to produce such and such traits; and when we consider the mediocrity of the scientists themselves outside the confines of their specialties, we can only shudder at the thought of what they will esteem most "favorable." None of our wise men ever pose the question of the end of all their marvels. The "wherefore" is resolutely passed by. The response which would occur to our contemporaries is: for the sake of happiness. Unfortunately, there is no longer any question of that. One of our best-known specialists in diseases of the nervous system writes: "We will be able to modify man's emotions, desires and thoughts as we have already done in a rudimentary way with tranquilizers."

It will be possible, says our specialist, to product a conviction or an impression of happiness without any real basis for it. Our man of the golden age, therefore, will be capable of "happiness" among the worst privations. Why, then, promise us extraordinary comforts, hygiene, knowledge, and nourishment if, by simply manipulating our nervous system, we can be happy without them? The last meager motive we could possibly ascribe to the technical adventure thus vanishes into thin air through the very existence of technique itself. But what good is it to pose questions of motives? Of Why? All that must be the work of some miserable intellectual who balks at technical progress. The attitude of the scientists, at any rate, is clear. Technique exists because it is technique. The golden age will be because it will be. Any other answer is superfluous."

Alan: Yes, in technique all they can see is technique. They exist for themselves and for their data collection, which is fed into computers with all the statistics, which spouts out what the future must be, and we bow down to the machine.

For those who are serious and wanting to know of the better minds at work over the last hundred years or so, add this book to your collection. It's "**The Technological Society**" by Jacques Ellul, who simply says things as they are. A man who mixed with all the top boys, big players who are bringing about a global system and a planned society, rigorously developed society where bureaucrats and technicians would use their techniques on the public, who would be completely unaware they were being brainwashed and updated like computers every few months or years. Much of what he said has already come to pass in this book. However, his way of putting it across, even though this is a translation really from the French, which is far, far superior, you can still see the kind of mind the man had and the knowledge that he'd acquired or been taught himself from very high quarters. That's why you're seeing techniques run your world today under the guise of terrorism. That's why you're seeing the interweaving connections between all organizations of social control, military, police, bureaucracies, government offices et cetera all working and coordinated together as they must do. They all mesh together and they become the state and you become the servants under such a system. You do what you're told. It doesn't have to make any sense to you at all, just obey.

Not a pretty picture but many saw it coming. These people were born before you and I. They saw it coming back in their day. It's been on the go for a long, long time and the plan is never altered. They use marketing to get youngsters involved and excited in the prospect of the next phase of the machine, where you'll have an implant in your brain with superpowers. You could be cleaning out a barn all day long and up to your knees in cow manure, but in your head you'll be having an

adventure on the moon. That's what they're talking about: The conquest of the mind, the total conquest of everyone's mind for their own use, because they're the experts and now you're not. That's their logic. That's their defense and we allow it to happen, even though we know where it's going, because we're addicted to the system ourselves. The toys, the gadgets, the gimmickry, and we follow the mousetraps one by one into the final one, and that is where they hope to lead us and make it seem excitable on the way, desirable.

With the creation of an egosyntonic society they knew that people who would avoid pain of any kind at any cost and seek pleasure would be easily led. Yet this whole thing about being happy; be happy all the time is a complete recent phenomenon, and lie of course, because as human beings we have to be able to experience all the range of emotions to be mature; and by experiencing all the emotions you become more human and more compassionate towards others. People who are egosyntonic and who were taught not to look at the negative side of things, anything unpleasant is negative, even though it might save your life to know - they're gone already and they will go along with the pied piper all the way to the brain chip quite happily.

So I'm sorry for being so long-winded with reading quotes out of this particular book, but for those serious students who want to know how we got here and why things are happening today, read the past. Read from people who are involved in the study of these sciences and who understood them perfectly well. See what they have to say. It's not just a matter of one day it may save your life. If you're compassionate at all and a full human being, then it might help to save other people, too, and those still to come. That means those who are born naturally, that is, and not "perfected" through test tubes, which is just the state's way of saying "we have an idea what kind of people *we want*," and believe you me, they'll be very obedient ones. Maybe strong, maybe healthy, but very obedient and they will not give any problems to authorities.

From Hamish and myself up here in Ontario, Canada, it's good night and may your god or your gods go with you.

"Revolution" by Dick Gaughan

I come like a comet new born
Like the sun that arises at morning
I come like the furious tempest
That follows a thundercloud's warning
I come like the fiery lava
From cloud-covered mountains volcanic
I come like a storm from the north
That the oceans awake to in panic

I come because tyranny planted
My seed in the hot desert sand
I come because masters have kindled
My fury with every command
I come because man cannot murder
The life-giving seed in his veins
I come because liberty cannot

Forever be fettered by chains

I come because tyrants imagine
That mankind is only their throne
I come because peace has been nourished
By bullets and cannons alone
I come because one world is two
And we face one another with rage
I come because guards have been posted
To keep out the hope of the age

From earliest times the oppressed
Have awaked me and called me to lead them
I guided them out of enslavement
And brought them to high roads of freedom
I marched at the head of their legions
And hailed a new world at its birth
And now I shall march with the peoples
Until they unfetter the earth

And you, all you sanctified moneybags
Bandits anointed and crowned
Your counterfeit towers of justice
And ethics will crash to the ground
I'll send my good sword through your hearts
That have drained the world's blood in their lust
Smash all your crowns and your scepters
And trample them into the dust

I'll rip off your rich purple garments
And tear them to rags and to shreds
And never again will their glitter
Be able to turn people's heads
At last your cold world will be robbed of
It's proud hypocritical glow
For we shall dissolve it as surely
As sunlight dissolves the deep snow

I'll break down your cobweb morality
Shatter the old chain of lies
Catch all your black-hooded preachers
And choke them as though they were flies
I'll put a quick end to your heavens
Your gods that are deaf to all prayers
Scatter your futile old spirits
And clean up the earth and the air

And though you may choke me and shoot me
And hang me your toil is in vain
No dungeon, no gallows can scare me
Nor will I be frightened by pain
Each time I'll arise from the earth
And break through all your weapons of doom
Until you are finished forever
Until you are dust in the tomb

(Transcribed by Linda)